

## REMARKS

### 1. Introduction

In the final Office Action mailed February 22, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-9, and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaoguz et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0059434 (“Karaoguz”) in view of Sundar et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0134636 (“Sundar”). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaoguz in view of Sundar and further in view of Thornton et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0101860 (“Thornton”).

In this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 12, and 13, and Applicants cancel claim 2. Claim 5 was canceled previously. Thus, with these amendments, claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-19 are left pending.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as amended herein.

### 2. Response to the Claim Rejections

#### a. **Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-11**

Of these claims, claim 1 is independent. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under § 103 as being unpatentable over Karaoguz in view of Sundar. In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to specify that the second data register is *co-located* with the PBX. This amendment is supported by page 14, lines 7-9 and by Figure 1 in the present application. Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is clearly allowable over Karaoguz/Sundar, as set forth below.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledged that Karaoguz does not show the claimed PBX or second data register elements. *See* Office Action, p. 3. Instead, the Examiner

relied on Sundar for these elements. Moreover, in rejecting claim 2 (now canceled), the Examiner argued that “Sundar further teaches second data register is integrated with PBX.” *See* Office Action, p. 4. In support of this position, the Examiner referred to paragraph 102 of Sundar, which states that “[i]n certain embodiments of the present invention a WLAN switch may be used in conjunction with a PBX system.”

However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reasoning. Even assuming that the WLAN switch can be identified with the “second data register” recited in claim 1 (a point that Applicants do not concede), the fact that the WLAN switch can be used in conjunction with the PBX does not mean that the WLAN switch is *integrated* with the PBX. Nonetheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to specify that the second data register is *co-located* with the PBX. In contrast, Sundar shows (*see* Fig. 31) WLAN switch 3104 and PBX 3102 as being *separate* network elements, not *co-located*. Thus, Applicants submit that Sundar does not disclose “a second data register co-located with said PBX and communicatively coupled to said first data register,” as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further submit that Karaoguz does not make up for this deficiency in Sundar.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended herein, is allowable over Karaoguz and Sundar for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 3, 4, and 6-11 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims are dependent on an allowable claim.

**b. Claims 12-19**

Of these claims, claim 12 is independent. The Examiner has rejected claim 12 under § 103 as being unpatentable over Karaoguz in view of Sundar. In response, Applicants have amended claim 12 to specify (as previously specified in claim 13) the function of the PBX

“receiving a service registration message from said multi-mode mobile station, said service registration message identifying said multi-mode mobile station.” Applicants submit that amended claim 12 is clearly allowable over Karaoguz/Sundar, as set forth below.

In rejecting claim 12, the Examiner acknowledged that Karaoguz did not show the claimed PBX or WLAN data register functions. *See* Office Action, p. 6. Instead, the Examiner relied on Sundar for these elements. Moreover, in rejecting claim 13, the Examiner argued that “Sundar further teaches PBX receiving a service registration message from multi-mode mobile station, service registration message identifying multi-mode mobile station.” *See* Office Action, pp. 6-7. Specifically, the Examiner cited to paragraphs 67 and 68 for this PBX function.

However, paragraphs 67 and 68 do not mention any PBX at all. Paragraph 67 discloses that the multimode mobile station is always attempting to stay connected to the macro network, for example, by attempting registration with the IS-41 core network or with the GSM-MAP core network. Paragraph 67 does not, however, suggest that such registration attempts would involve a PBX.

Paragraph 68 describes an embodiment (shown in Figure 5) in which the macro network sends information to the mobile station that includes the macro network cell-ids where the mobile station should attempt to detect or discover an enterprise WLAN. This description, however, does not mention any PBX, and the described embodiment shown in Figure 5 does not include any PBX.

It is in paragraphs 101-107, not paragraphs 67-68, that Sundar discusses an embodiment that includes a PBX. Paragraphs 101-107, however, do not describe the PBX as receiving a service registration message from the multi-mode mobile station. Thus, Applicants submit that Sundar does not disclose “a private branch exchange (PBX), communicatively coupled to said

wireless access point, receiving a service registration message from said multi-mode mobile station, said service registration message identifying said multi-mode mobile station.” Applicants further submit that Karaoguz does not make up for this deficiency in Sundar.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is allowable over Karaoguz and Sundar for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 13-19 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims are dependent on an allowable claim.

### 3. **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 16, 2007

By: Richard A. Machonkin  
Richard A. Machonkin  
Reg. No. 41,962